

Appl. No. 10/668,139  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 13, 2005

**REMARKS**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowability of the subject matter of claims 3, 5, 11 and 14-17, if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the following comments.

In the Office Action, mailed July 13, 2005, claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,572,709 to Risher (the "Risher patent"). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Risher patent, in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,711,721 to Johnson (the "Johnson patent"). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Risher patent, in view of US Patent No 5,797,806 to Butler (the "Butler patent"). Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly anticipated by the Risher patent in view of an Official Notice. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly unenabled. The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a), for failing to depict the feature of claim 6.

Before addressing the issues raised in the Office Action, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' undersigned attorney of record. In the telephone interview, the parties discussed the pending rejections and proposed new claims.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner articulated his position that claim 1 needed to define more clearly the manner in which axial rotation of the ferrule is inhibited. He identified the Risher patent as disclosing the use of adhesive between the hosel and ferrule, thereby inhibiting axial rotation of the ferrule. He asserted that the relevant language in claim 1, as originally constructed (i.e., "the lower portion having an interior surface about the axial bore configured to cooperate with the end of the hosel to inhibit axial rotation of the ferrule about the hosel") was inadequate to exclude Risher's approach.

Appl. No. 10/668,139  
Amtd. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 13, 2005

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and added claims 25-28. These amendments, and the distinctions of the claimed invention from the cited references, are discussed below.

**I. The Prior-Art Rejections of Claim 1, 2, 4, 6-7 and 9-10.**

As mentioned above, Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 were rejected as allegedly anticipated by the Risher patent. Claims 9 and 10 were rejected as allegedly anticipated by the Risher patent in view of an Official Notice. Claims 6 and 8 were rejected as allegedly obvious, as set forth above.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the features of allowable claim 3, to include the upper portion of the body having a plurality of protrusions positioned on an interior surface in the axial bore. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 7-8 depend from claim 1, adding features that further define the invention and distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 are now moot.

As amended, claim 9 requires, among other things, that the hosel and the ferrule "engage each other in an interlocking fit that inhibits axial rotation." The Risher patent fails to disclose, or even suggest, a golf club having all of the features of claim 9. For example, as seen in FIG. 4, the hosel and the ferrule of the Risher patent are not configured to engage each other in an interlocking fit that inhibits axial rotation. As correctly identified by the Examiner, the use of adhesive is only manner in which inhibition of axial rotation can be inferred from the Risher patent. No interlocking fit is formed, as required by claim 9.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9, adding features that further define the invention and distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, the prior-art rejections of claims 9 and 10 are now improper and should be withdrawn.

**II. The Enablement Rejection of Claim 6 and Related Objection to the Drawings.**

As mentioned above, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly unenabled. The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a), for failing to depict the feature of claim 6.

Appl. No. 10/668,139  
Amdt. dated November 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 13, 2005

In response, Applicants amended claim 6 to recite "a chamfer surface at a bottom end of the body." No new matter has been added. The enablement rejection of claim 6 and the objection to the drawings are now moot and should be withdrawn.

### III. New Claims 25-28

By this Amendment, Applicants have added new claim 25 directed to a ferrule for a golf club that includes, among other things, a plurality of protrusions positioned on an interior surface in an upper portion thereof. No new matter has been added.

### IV. Conclusion


This application should be in condition for allowance. If any matters remain outstanding after consideration of this Amendment that the Examiner believes might be expedited by a telephone conference with Applicants' representative, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. As indicated in the transmittal form filed herewith, please charge any fees due in connection with this filing to our Deposit Account No. 19-1853.

Date: November 10, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

By:



Kyriacos Tsircou  
Registration No. 53,705

333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 620-1780  
Facsimile: (213) 620-1398